

**SPF/SIG Grant Review Workgroup  
Draft Minutes  
February 23th, 2007  
Division of Mental Health and Addiction  
IGCS Room 12  
9:00 AM to 10:30 AM**

**Attendance:** (Voting) Jeff Barber, Dave Bozell, Sonya Cleveland,  
(Non-Voting) Travis Pulver, Marcia French and Kim Manlove.

**Minutes Approval:** The minutes of the February 9<sup>th</sup>, 2007 were approved as distributed.

**Request for Services (RFS) Review:** Marcia French reported that she received a call and a follow-up email from our interim SAMHSA/CSAP Project Officer Bettina Scott with a request for clarification on six items before finalizing the approval of the Indiana SPF SIG Strategic Plan and RFS. Project Staff provided a response and is awaiting a reply from SAMHSA/CSAP. She expressed the hope that the reply would come before the end of the day. The workgroup members asked if the questions from CSAP and the Project Team's responses could be added to the minutes. They are:

**CSAP**

- *Will you be funding counties or coalitions?*
- *Who is eligible to apply under your RFS?*
- *When you define communities in the RFS, what does that mean? What is a community?*
- *Where are the big cities (Indianapolis, Terre Haute, etc.) how can we identify them in the plan? What is their status?*
- *Why did you select 18-25 year olds as the target for under-age drinking? Why not 16-25 year olds?*
- *Did you look at "crack" in urban areas when you were considering cocaine as a drug of abuse?*

**Project Team**

Both, we will be funding coalitions which may choose to serve all or part of a county, after they have completed their assessment and identify areas of highest need and/or highest contributor. We recognize this will vary from one county to another. This may include funding a specific neighborhood based on identified risk and protective factors following their assessment.

1. Multiple counties or coalitions that combine to serve the identified populations of need. They will combine to share resources and provide expanded opportunities for service. We require MOU's for these partnerships.
2. A community could include a county, neighborhood or identified group of need, the final definition of county will be determined by the recipients completion of the assessment process.
3. The biggest cities are identified by the SEOW Indicator Tables.
4. The ages were identified based on the data the SEOW provided by the state after their analysis.
5. Yes, data analysis did not bear that out.

Jeff Barber asked if there was a pre-registration process in place for the Pre-Conference Informational Session on March 1<sup>st</sup>. Marcia reported there was no pre-registration process but a registration form would be filled out when participants arrive.

**GRW Charge and Responsibility:** Kim Manlove asked the workgroup to review the revised charge distributed. He pointed out that the only change was to add a sentence clarifying that the GRW's decisions on sub-grantees would in turn be submitted to the GAC for final approval. The revised charge is as follows:

*The Grant Review Workgroup (GRW) is charged with the responsibility of oversight and administration of the grant review process for the selection of sub-grantees of the Indiana Strategic Prevention Framework State Incentive Grant Project. Once the review process is complete the GRW will submit final recommendations of sub-grantees to the SPF SIG Governor's Advisory Council for approval. The GRW will coordinate and integrate its efforts with the other workgroups established by the Governors Advisory Council.*

**Logistics of Review Process: GRW REVIEW PROCESS** Jeff introduced the discussion by suggesting that there be two reviewers per proposal, a primary and secondary; reviewers can and should consult with one another while reviewing the proposals and that the GRW should review the timeline in the roll out document and decide if the dates suggested were still appropriate for the process to take place. He also suggested that the workgroup be mindful that should the process get backed up it might be necessary to forgo the Expert Review Team evaluation portion. The workgroup reviewed the original roll-out time frame and agreed that the dates it contained for the review process were still valid. They are:

- Expert Review Team (ERT) Evaluation April 9<sup>th</sup> through April 16<sup>th</sup>
- ERT Recommendations due to GRW April 16<sup>th</sup>
- GRW primary and secondary reviewers read and score grant proposals April 9<sup>th</sup> through April 20<sup>th</sup>
- GRW Final Selection Meeting April 23<sup>rd</sup>

Grant proposals will be randomly assigned to GRW members who will work to ensure that primary and secondary reviewers on any given proposal will not be from the same governmental agency. The Chair, assisted by the Project Team, will also ensure there are no conflicts of interest in the assignment process; however, workgroup members will also be responsible for self reporting conflicts of interest to the Chair. A CD containing all the proposals will be available to the GRW on the 9<sup>th</sup> of April so that members can have the opportunity see all proposals submitted.

Kim passed out a scoring sheet that is designed to be used electronically or in hard copy. The workgroup asked for a free text comment field to be inserted after each section and the addition of a separate column for the reviewers actual scoring. (A copy of the revised scoring sheet is attached to these minutes).

**EXPERT REVIEW TEAM** Jeff suggested that some of the members of the Expert Review Teams be drawn from the drawn from the GAC and the SEOW. The following names were offered: Dean Babcock, Mike Cunegin, Jim Ryser, Harold Thompson, Matt Strittmatter, Jim Wolf, Miranda Spitznagle and Amanda (Thornton) Coleman. Marcia agreed to distribute electronically the membership lists of our council, committees and workgroup. The workgroup then discussed the possible criteria to be used by the ERT in their review of the proposals. Suggestions included doing a global assessment, the practicality of the proposal, ensuring capacity and viability or the possibility of employing the same scoring criteria the GRW will use. Travis Pulver from CJI volunteered to develop some discussion points for the ERT criteria that would take into account that Training and Outreach Workgroup's suggestion that ERTs be made of up three members, two with expertise in prevention and one with expertise in organizational evaluation and development.

The discussion of Review Panel logistics concluded with a look ahead to the contracting portion of the project and what can be done, within the bureaucracy to ease and facilitate the approval of the contracts once the grantees are selected. Sonya Cleveland suggested that the project work closely with both Scott Tittle and John Von Arx in this regard.

**Prospective Urban vs. Rural Grantees:** Jeff acknowledged that this subject will depend on the actual proposals received and will defer the topic until that time.

**Future Meeting Schedule:** The Workgroup schedule for the coming weeks will be:

- March 2<sup>nd</sup> - 1:00 PM to 2:30 PM IGCS Room 21 This will be a joint meeting of the GRW and the Training and Outreach Workgroup the day after the Pre-Conference Informational Session.
- March 16<sup>th</sup> - 1:00 PM to 2:30 PM
- March 23<sup>rd</sup> – 9:00 AM to 10:30 AM
- March 30<sup>th</sup> - 9:00 AM to 10:30 AM
- April 13<sup>th</sup> - 9:00 AM to 10:30 AM

**Adjournment:** The meeting was adjourned at 10:15 AM.